

claims 1-102 of the present application. For example, given the necessity of a hand-off feature in a system using portable handset terminals, there is no suggestion in West that it would have been obvious to also include such a feature in a fixed system. However, the present invention has recognized the advantage of such a feature in a fixed system. In particular, if a fixed terminal detects a better signal from another base station, it may initiate hand-off in order to improve the clarity of the signal. Accordingly, Applicants submit that there has been no showing that it would have been obvious to modify claims 1-65 of the Connolly patent in view of West to produce the presently claimed invention.

Applicants will submit a substitute declaration to correct the defect noted in the Office Action.

CONCLUSION

In view of the arguments above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1-102 for double patenting should be withdrawn. If the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,



William F. Prendergast
Registration No. 34,699
Attorney for Applicants

Date: May 13, 1996

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4200

B